

1 **FOLEY & LARDNER LLP**
 2 ONE MARITIME PLAZA, SIXTH FLOOR
 3 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3409
 4 TELEPHONE: 415.434.4484
 5 FACSIMILE: 415.434.4507

6 LAURENCE R. ARNOLD, CA BAR NO. 133715
 7 EILEEN R. RIDLEY, CA BAR NO. 151735
 8 SCOTT P. INCIARDI, CA BAR NO. 228814
 9 Attorneys for STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
 10 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

11
 12
 13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
 16 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
 17 HOSPITAL,

18 Petitioners,

19 vs.

20 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
 21 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715,

22 Respondent.

23 Case No: 5:07-CV-05158-JF

24 STANFORD HOSPITAL AND
 25 CLINICS AND LUCILE PACKARD
 26 CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL'S MOTION
 27 TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO
 28 DISCOVERY SUBPOENA
 PROPOUNDED TO UHW

Date: August 27, 2008

Time: 9:30 A.M.

Dept: Courtroom 4, 5th Floor

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel
 Magis. Judge: Hon. Richard Seeborg

29 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
 30 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715

31 Petitioner and Counter-
 32 Respondent,

33 vs.

34 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
 35 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
 36 HOSPITAL

37 Respondents and Counter-
 38 Petitioners.

39 Case No: 5:08-CV-00213-JF

40 Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

41 STANFORD HOSPITAL AND CLINICS AND LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL'S MOTION TO
 42 COMPEL RESPONSES TO DISCOVERY SUBPOENA PROPOUNDED TO UHW
 43 CASE NOS. 5:07-CV-05158-JF, 5:08-CV-00213-JF, 5:08-CV-00215-JF;
 44 5:08-CV-00216-JF; 5:08-CV-01726-JF; 5:08-CV-01727-JF

1 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
2 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715

Case No: 5:08-CV-00215-JF

3 Petitioner,

4 vs.

5 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
6 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
7 HOSPITAL

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

8 Respondents.

9 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
10 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715

Case No: 5:08-CV-00216-JF

11 Petitioner,

12 vs.

13 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
14 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
15 HOSPITAL

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

16 Respondents.

17 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
18 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715

Case No: 5:08-CV-01726-JF

19 Petitioner,

20 vs.

21 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
22 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
23 HOSPITAL

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

24 Respondents.

25 SERVICE EMPLOYEES
26 INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 715

Case No: 5:08-CV-01727-JF

27 Petitioner,

28 vs.

29 STANFORD HOSPITAL & CLINICS and
30 LUCILE PACKARD CHILDREN'S
31 HOSPITAL

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

32 Respondents.

1

2 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

3 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD
 4 HEREIN:

5 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 27, 2008 at 9:30 AM or as soon
 6 thereafter as counsel may be heard in Courtroom Four on the Fifth Floor of the above
 7 entitled court, located at 280 South 1st Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Stanford Hospitals &
 8 Clinics and Lucille Packard Children's Hospital (collectively the "Hospitals") will bring
 9 on for hearing their Motion to Compel Responses To Discovery Subpoena Propounded to
 10 Service International Employees International Union, United Healthcare Workers – West
 11 ("UHW").

12 This motion is made on the grounds that UHW has failed to respond to subpoenas
 13 for business records served upon it by the Hospitals. This Motion is based upon this
 14 Notice of Motion and Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the
 15 Declaration of Eileen R. Ridley, the records and pleadings on file herein, and upon such
 16 oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the time of the hearing thereon.

17 **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

18 I. **INTRODUCTION**

19 These actions, declared related in the Court's order of February 29, 2008, involve
 20 Stanford Hospital And Clinics and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (the "Hospitals")
 21 and three locals of the Service Employees International Union ("SEIU") known as SEIU,
 22 Local 715 ("Local 715"), SEIU Local 521 ("Local 521") and SEIU, United Healthcare
 23 Workers – West ("UHW") (sometimes collectively the "Locals"). Local 715 is a party to
 24 each of the actions. Local 521 and UHW are not parties. After a case management
 25 conference on April 25, 2008 during which the Court specifically approved discovery
 26 into the existence, representation, and transactions of Local 715, the Hospitals issued
 27 requests for production of documents ("RFPs") to Local 715 and business records

1 subpoenas on Local 521 and UHW. UHW, after making procedurally and substantively
 2 improper objections, failed to respond to the subpoena.

3 As UHW has, without justification, completely failed to produce the subpoenaed
 4 documents, the Hospitals request that the Court order that UHW comply with the
 5 subpoenas. Furthermore, particularly given that the Locals are all represented by the
 6 same law firm, their conduct reflects a blatant and concerted attempt to “stonewall” the
 7 Hospitals, and the Hospitals request that the Court impose appropriate sanctions.

8 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

9 Each of these actions involves the Hospitals’ obligation to arbitrate with Local 715
 10 pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement (the “CBA”) and/or to comply with
 11 arbitration awards purportedly issued pursuant to the CBA. The Hospitals have alleged
 12 that Local 715, certified as the exclusive bargaining representative of a bargaining unit of
 13 Hospital employees (the “Bargaining Unit”) in 1998, has effectively ceased to exist, and
 14 that therefore there is no entity to act as petitioner in these actions and no party with
 15 whom the Hospitals have an obligation to arbitrate.¹ [Declaration Of Eileen Ridley In
 16 Support Of Motion (“Ridey Decl.”) Exh. B-D.] The Hospitals also assert that the
 17 attorneys from the law firm of Weinberg Roger & Rosenfeld (the “Weinberg Firm” or
 18 “Weinberg”) who have sought to participate in arbitration proceedings with the Hospitals
 19 do not actually represent Local 715, but instead are retained by UHW and are acting
 20 under the guise of an invalid servicing agreement (the “Servicing Agreement”). [Ridley
 21 Decl. Exh. B-D.]

22 On April 25, 2008, the Court held a case management conference. At the CMC,
 23 counsel for Local 715 argued that no discovery was necessary in the case. The Hospitals’
 24 counsel argued, however, that, due to the Hospitals’ claims regarding the status of Local
 25

26 ¹ The Hospitals contend that Local 715 was merged into Local 521 and an improper
 27 attempt was made to merge or transfer the Hospitals’ bargaining unit to UHW.

1 715, some discovery was necessary before dispositive motions could be filed.
 2 Specifically, it was argued that discovery was necessary on the issues of Local 715's
 3 continued existence, Local 715's resources, its capacity as representative of the
 4 Bargaining Unit, and the legal representation provided to Local 715. [Ridley Decl. Exh.
 5 E (P. 4-5).] The Court agreed and specifically approved discovery into these limited
 6 areas. [Ridley Decl. Exh. E (P. 13-14).]

7 Accordingly, on May 16, 2008, the Hospitals served on UHW a business records
 8 subpoena.² [Ridley Decl. Exh. L-Q.] The document sought in the subpoena pertains to:
 9 (1) the existence or non-existence of Local 715; (2) the representative status of Local 715
 10 (3) the nature of the representation provided by Weinberg; and (4) the resources of Local
 11 715 and the use and movement of those resources.

12 **A. UHW "Objects" To The Subpoenas**

13 On May 29, 2008, Andrea Laiacona from the Weinberg Firm, on behalf of Local
 14 521, faxed a letter to Eileen Ridley, counsel for the Hospitals purporting to object to the
 15 subpoenas. [Ridley Decl. Exh. Y.] Ms. Laiacona objected that the subpoenas sought
 16 information that was irrelevant, overbroad, unduly burdensome, privileged, and/or
 17 confidential. Ms. Laiacona's letter did not address any of the document requests
 18 specifically, and, although privilege was raised, did not include a "privilege log."

19 On the same day, Ms. Ridley received a fax from William A. Sokol, another
 20 attorney with the Weinberg Firm on behalf of UHW. The content of the letter was
 21 essentially identical to that of Ms. Laiacona's letter.³ [Ridley Decl. Exh. X.]

22

23 ² Six sets of RFPs were served on Local 715, one in each of the six cases. Likewise,
 24 identical subpoenas were served on Local 521 and UHW in all six cases. The content of
 25 the RFPs and subpoenas were, however, identical, and the Hospitals indicated that, in the
 26 interest of efficiency, the responding parties could serve a single set of documents in
 27 response to the requests in all six cases. [Ridley Decl. Exh. Z & AA]

28 ³ Both letters were actually signed by "BH" who Ms. Ridley took to be Bruce Harland,
 29 another Weinberg Attorney who has responded on behalf of Local 715. [Ridley Decl. ¶
 30 10.]

1 On June 9, 2008, Ms. Ridley sent letters to Ms. Laiacaona and Mr. Sokol
 2 responding to their “objections.” Ms. Ridley informed Ms. Laiacaona and Ms. Sokol that
 3 their objections were not well-taken, but offered to work with them in the event that they
 4 were concerned as to the volume of documents to be produced, or to address any other
 5 logistical and/or expense issues that might arise. [Ridley Decl. Exh. Z-AA.] Mr. Sokol,
 6 responded by claiming that the subpoenas were abusive and harassing. [Ridley Decl.
 7 Exh. BB.]

8 **B. UHW Fails To Respond To The Subpoena**

9 Neither of the Locals responded to Ms. Ridley’s May 9, 2008 letter before the
 10 deadline to respond to the subpoenas. [Ridley Decl. ¶ 13.] The responses of Local 521
 11 and UHW to the subpoenas were due on June 18, 2008. However, neither local has
 12 provided any response to date. [Ridley Decl. ¶ 13.]

13 On June 26, 2006 – over a week after responses to the subpoenas were due – Ms.
 14 Laiacaona sent a letter to Ms. Ridley responding to her letter of May 9, 2008. She stated
 15 that she was “reiterating” her position stated in her May 29, 2008 letter, asserted
 16 (incorrectly) that the Hospitals had conceded that Local 715 exists, and accused the
 17 Hospitals of propounding discovery in bad faith and for purposes of harassment. [Ridley
 18 Decl. Exh. CC.]

19 Ms. Ridley and her associate Scott Inciardi responded to these letters via fax on
 20 the evening of June 30, 2008, requesting that Ms. Laiacaona and Mr. Sokol confirm that
 21 their clients would provide responses to the subpoenas to avoid the necessity of a motion
 22 to compel. [Ridley Decl. Exh. NN-OO.]

23 On July 9, 2008, Ms. Ridley and Mr. Harland met and conferred regarding
 24 outstanding discovery issues, including the responses of Local 521 and UHW to the
 25 subpoenas. Ms. Ridley outlined the Hospitals’ position regarding the Locals’ obligation
 26 to produce documents and requested again that Local 521 and UHW respond to the
 27 subpoenas. [Ridley Decl. ¶ 25 & Exh. WW.] The parties have, however, been unable to

1 resolve the matter informally.

2 **III. DISCUSSION**

3 **A. UHW Completely And Without Justification Failed To Provide
4 Responses To The Subpoena**

5 The failure of UHW to comply with the subpoenas issued to them could not be
6 more clear; they refused to respond altogether. While both locals purported to object to
7 the subpoenas, their objections consisted of nothing more than unsupported and
8 generalized boilerplate assertions. [Ridley Decl. Exh. X & Y.] Under Federal Rule 45,
9 non-parties objecting to subpoenas are subject to the same requirement applicable to
10 parties responding to discovery requests, i.e., that their objections be particularized.

11 *Sabol v. Brooks*, 469 F.Supp.2d 324, 328-329 (D.MD. 2006). A generalized unsupported
12 objection to a subpoena is insufficient, and constitutes a waiver of such objections. *Id.*
13 *Thomas v. Hickman*, 2007 WL 4302974 (E.D.Cal. 2007) (Slip Op. at 10) (“Objections
14 that are not sufficiently specific, such as statements that requests are overly broad,
15 burdensome, or oppressive, are waived.”); *Ramirez v. City Of Los Angeles*, 231 F.R.D.
16 407, 409 (E.D.Cal. 2005) (“it is well-settled that all grounds for objection must be stated
17 with specificity.”).

18 Additionally, Rule 45(d)(2)(A) specifically provides that a party objecting to a
19 subpoena on the grounds that it requires the production of documents protected by a
20 privilege or as trial preparation material must provide a privilege log describing the
21 nature of withheld documents with sufficient specificity to allow the subpoenaing party to
22 assess the claim of privilege or protection. Although UHW asserted the attorney-client
23 privilege and work product doctrine, they did not provide the required privilege log.

24 In sum, UHW’s attempt to object to the subpoenas was patently and totally
25 inadequate, and therefore, such objections were waived. Both locals have provided no
26 response whatsoever to the subpoenas. This Court should order compliance with the
27 subpoenas and impose sanctions.

1 **B. Local 715, Local 521 And UHW Have Chosen To Engage In A**
 2 **Concerted Effort To Frustrate Discovery In This Case, And Their**
 3 **Conduct Should Result In Sanctions**

4 The Locals, all being represented by the same firm, were well aware that Judge
 5 Fogel ruled at the CMC that the Hospitals were entitled to seek discovery on the status of
 6 Local 715, its representative status, its legal representation, and its transactions with other
 7 SEIU Locals, and that such discovery needed to be completed expeditiously in order to
 8 allow the parties to file dispositive motions on July 18, 2008. Yet, rather than make a
 9 good faith response, UHW chose to refuse to respond to the subpoenas. The Locals'
 10 attorneys have refused to cooperate with counsel for the Hospitals. Rather than working
 11 with the Hospitals, they have chosen to resort to shrill and empty accusations of
 12 harassment and bad faith. This conduct created the necessity for this motion.⁴

13 This Court is authorized to hold in contempt any person who fails to obey a
 14 subpoena without adequate excuse. F.R.Civ.P. 45(e). Given the Locals' complete failure
 15 to adhere to the spirit and the letter of the federal discovery rules, an order holding UHW
 16 in contempt is appropriate. The Hospitals respectfully request that that the Court order
 17 sanctions against UHW and its counsel for the costs associated with bringing this motion,
 18 including attorneys fees. The Hospitals estimate that they have spent and/or anticipate
 19 spending approximately \$12,000 to bring this motion. [Ridley Decl. ¶ 35.]

20 **IV. CONCLUSION**

21 For the foregoing reasons, Stanford Hospital And Clinics and Lucile Packard
 22 Children's Hospital respectfully request that the motion be granted, that UHW be ordered
 23 to provide complete responses to the subpoenas, and that appropriate sanctions be
 24

25

⁴ This conduct should also be viewed in the context of the Weinberg Firm's refusal to
 26 produce witnesses for depositions and to cooperate in selecting alternative dates for
 27 depositions as detailed in the Hospitals' Motion to Compel Depositions filed concurrently
 with this motion.

1 imposed.

2 Dated: July 11, 2008

3 FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
4 LAURENCE R. ARNOLD
EILEEN R. RIDLEY
SCOTT P. INCIARDI

5

6

7 By: /s/ _____
8 EILEEN R. RIDLEY
9 Attorneys for STANFORD HOSPITAL &
CLINICS and LUCILE PACKARD
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28